men's assertions, but it would not do to lose the opportunity altogether, and therefore he denies the claims for rapidity of execution, which we and others have set up for the architect in reply to that cry: points out how many appliances of modern science and machinery were at command, omits all mention of causes of delay over which the architect had no control, and winds up with the remark that it "is not, after all, any extraordinary performance." We will simply put our word against the reviewer's, and we assert, as we have before done, that it is an extraordinary performance, and there stands the building to justify us. He then proceeds to point out sundry contemplated objectionable arrangements, which were prevented by "the able remonstrances and observations" of Lord Sudeley.* "In the midst of the Victoria Tower was to have been a central pillar, as a sort of pivot for the state coach, with its eight prancing horses to whirl round; then when this was abandoned as inexpedient, a gateway was provided for the admission of the royal equipages, but so narrow, that there were not six inches on each side of the wheels to allow for a swerve of the quadrupeds, or for the passage of the attendants who on that occasion accompany the procession on foot." And then her Majesty, on alighting, was to ascend twenty-five steps in a flight, without rest or landing place. The writer forgets to say that the proposed diameter of the tower was 70 feet when the central pillar was contemplated, instead of what it now is. And no one would fancy that the gateway for the royal equipages and foot attendants which he alludes to, is merely for the carriage to draw off into an inner court, to wait until wanted. As to the steps, they may or may not have been ill-considered: but there are many Italian precedents for a greater number of steps in a flight than are here mentioned. The propriety of the arrangement would of course greatly depend upon the rise and tread of the steps, of which, for want of knowledge, we can say nothing.

According to our critic, "the only parties who have really been attended to, seem to have been the officials of either chamber, for whom the architect has obligingly provided, at the public expense, dwelling-houses and dining-rooms rivalling the magnificence of Belgrave-square." The force of this remark is shewn by the fact that, within two or three days after its publication, another class of objectors in the House of Commons, inquired why certain alterations were being made, and were informed that it was in consequence of the *want of sufficient accommodation for the officers of the house.*

"Of so much of the interior as is completed," says the reviewer, "it is impossible to speak without a *certain* degree of disapprobation." Most candid and considerate critic! One might imagine, from the tone of the expression, that the whole of the preceding observations had been devoted to the extolment of beauties, and that at last the writer found it necessary to qualify his too ardent praise by the expression of "a certain degree of disapprobation." The interior, he says, has been committed, it is believed, by Mr. Barry to Mr. Pugin. No such thing is believed. As we have said several times, the whole of the internal decorations are executed from the sketches and directions of Mr. Barry: Mr. Pugin only operates with Mr. B. in carrying out his ideas. In a letter which Mr. Pugin addressed to us in 1845, soon after his appointment, he says, first stating what his province is,—"In fulfilling the duties of my office, I do not do anything whatever on my own responsibility; all models and working drawings being prepared from Mr. Barry's designs, and submitted to him for his approval or alteration previous to their being carried into effect. In fine, my occupation is simply to assist in carrying out practically Mr. Barry's own designs and views in all respects."* It is only just to Mr. Pugin to say, therefore, that while Mr. Barry is entitled to all the praise which is due to a successful result, he also is alone responsible for defects which may be justly complained of.

These defects in a candid mind will weigh little put beside the many beauties and merits of the design, the simplicity and excellence of the plan, the goodness of the details, the artistic power shewn in the decorations, and the scientific skill and variety of resources exhibited in the construction.

* The article swerves strongly throughout of what may be called the Sudeley faction.

* See Vol. III., p. 426.

DESCRIPTION OF A BUILDING ERECTED IN QUEEN-STREET, GLASGOW.

IT has occurred to me, that were architects in the habit of writing descriptions of the buildings they erected, especially when circumstances influenced in any peculiar manner the design or arrangement, or their own ideas had taken any peculiar bent; and were such *notanda* to be permanently recorded in a journal like THE BUILDER, a mass of precedents would be accumulated which would prove of much use to the profession; and, if the practice were general, would reward those who took the pains to do so, and who thus gave away the results of their experience. Sir John Soane published his works; as, also, did Mr. Foulstone, of Plymouth; and there may be other instances, which I do not at present recollect, of architects who have put into a useful form, not the designs merely, but the practical particulars, of their executed works: it has been urged, too, how useful publications such as these would be; but, I think, if the authors were to bring forward these precedents at their own proper junctures, all the greater would be their utility and interest; for the latter, at least, is often as much dependent on the circumstances of time as on those of place.

It was under impressions such as these, that I threw together some memoranda of a building, for mercantile purposes, I have just completed in Glasgow, for James Lumsden, Esq., of Yoker, the late Lord Provost; and which, with an outline of the elevation, and some constructive details, I beg to subjoin.

The elevation is that of the front to Queen-street, the gateway in centre leading into Canada-court.

Fig 2 is a transverse section of the roof.

A leading innovation in this building consists in the use of two colours of stone: the principal, *white*, for shop-piers, entire first story over shops, architraves and other window-dressings, rustications, cornices, strings, parapet, and chimney-shafts; and the other *red*, for the walling of the two upper stories. London readers will readily understand the effect produced, seeing the number of buildings having a similar appearance, which have been erected in the metropolis of late years, having red-brick walling, and stone, or imitation stone, dressings: in the present case, the whole being rubbed-ashlar masonry, the courses in the red portion range with those of the white, and the former is of a less fiery hue than red brick. The thing has been questioned here, by some unused to such polychromic combinations; and the idea being first proposed and then deprecated, of imitating, in a country rich in stone, the practice of a locality where brick, of necessity, takes its place; without its ever occurring that, in London, in order to produce the effect desired by the artist, instead of the ordinary saffron-coloured stock-bricks being used in similar cases, additional expense and trouble are gone to to employ the red bricks, by which a pleasing contrast is to be obtained. The object sought in employing the red stone was, of course, to enhance the effect of the white, and give greater relief to the moulded-work.*

Mr. Edward Richardson made lately, in THE BUILDER,† some remarks on contrasts in stone, which contained sentiments exactly corresponding to my own notions on the subject.

The fire-clay of the Garnkirk works, near Glasgow, I gladly made available for the panels of honeysuckle ornament under the first floor windows, and the trusses supporting balconies, shop cornice, &c., by which means a much greater degree of durability is secured for the small carvings than would be obtained in free-stone. In the metropolis, some time back, terra-cotta ornaments were a good deal employed, though not to the extent to which they might be with advantage. The use of this material for exterior ornamentation is of ancient date, for it was usual to introduce subjects executed in it within the pediments of the Roman temples; the quadrigæ, also, with which these are believed to have been surmounted, was, in the case of the temple of Jupiter Capitolinus, composed of the same. The reader will probably remember the medallions of the Roman emperors which are inserted in the walls of Wolsey's portion of Hampton Court Palace: these bear testimony to the enduring nature of terra-cotta, and suggest that, had they been of any other stone, and thus exposed to the vicissitudes of our climate, these beautiful works of art would not now present themselves in so perfect a condition.

In these times, when so much discussion arises touching the best forms of cast-iron beams, it may be worth mentioning that I was afforded, through the agency of the destructive element which rendered these works necessary, an ample opportunity for adapting broken pillars to lintelling purposes; and, with the aid of new templates — square outside and curved within — to form solid end-bearings: very good lintels they made: two of them, 6 inches in diameter, over an 8-feet opening in a 2-feet stone wall, made a very satisfactory support to a very considerable superincumbent weight. Where cast-iron beams of considerable span were necessary, I had occasion to introduce a wrought-iron rod, with forked ends, let into the underside of the beam, secured at each end with dowels of wrought-iron let down through the bottom flange of the beam into the masonry on which it rests. In introducing these rods, I was actuated by the consideration that, in mercantile warehouses, there are not only very weighty loads to be borne, but, occasionally, severe concussive forces to resist; and that, as a precautionary provision, they would be efficient, in the event of a beam being suddenly broken, in preventing the serious consequences which would ensue from its fall. In other cases, where the span was not so great, I adopted a mode which has lately obtained here, wherein a rolled plate of malleable iron is introduced between two flitches of timber, and the whole well bolted together: the beams I employed were to a span of about 26 feet: the timbers were 13 inches by 6 inches each, the iron the full length by the full depth, and half an inch thick. This combination appears to me to make a very satisfactory beam,—the iron giving *strength*, and the wood contributing, besides its strength, the *stiffness*. With this compound beam there are not the same grounds for hesitation in regard to mortising for floor joists as with a beam consisting solely of timber, since its main strength does not lie in the portion to be cut.

In the sunk basement, and under part of Canada-court, there is a rather extensive vaultage, in forming which I had occasion to use a considerable number of cast-iron columns. These columns I made of the + in preference to the O section, notwithstanding Mr. Hodgkinson's having satisfactorily shewn that "the strength of a pillar formed like the connecting-rod of a steam-engine, compared to that of one containing the same metal, but formed of a uniform hollow, is but as 17,578 to 39,645;" for I had found that there was this serious risk attending the tubular form,

* A similar combination is presented in the new City Schools at Bristol, and with good effect.—ED.

† *Vide* p. 319, *ante*.

For Fast, Accurate OCR and PDF Compression go to our website